

ADA 124185

DTIC FILE COPY

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 82-1	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A124185	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Measurement of Motivational Style: A Response Format		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Frank J. Landy & Wendy S. Becker		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N0014-31-K-0197
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS The Pennsylvania State University Department of Psychology, 450 Moore Building University Park, PA 16802		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR 170-926
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Organizational Effectiveness Research Program Office of Naval Research (Code 452) Arlington, VA 22217		12. REPORT DATE January, 1983
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 36
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> Motivation Work Motivation Cognitive Adaptation Cognitive Development </div> <div> Need Theory Equity Theory Stimulus/Response </div> </div>		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Adaptive motivation theory proposes different styles of motivated behavior. These are identified as stimulus/response, need, equity, and rational styles. This report outlines an initial approach to the measurement of motivational style, using paragraph descriptions of four styles of motivation, and a random style. Response patterns for the different styles are examined by demographic variables, such as age and work experience. Implications for the measurement of motivational style are discussed.		

DD FORM 1473  
1 JAN 73EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE  
S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

**Measurement of Motivational Style:**

**A Response Format**

**Technical Report, January, 1983**

**Frank J. Landy & Wendy S. Becker**

**The Pennsylvania State University**

**Research sponsored by Organizational Effectiveness Research Programs,  
Office of Naval Research (Code 452) under Contract No. N0014-81-K-0197;  
NR 170 - 926**

**Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the  
United States Government.**

**Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.**

## MEASUREMENT OF MOTIVATIONAL STYLE: A RESPONSE FORMAT

Frank J. Landy and Wendy Becker

The Pennsylvania State University

Research in human motivation can be best characterized as an attempt to champion the substantive propositions of one theory at the expense of some alternative theory. With few exceptions (Locke, Shaw, Saari, and Latham, 1981), this research has seldom involved direct tests of opposing theoretical positions. Instead, the research has generally been parametric and has revolved around demonstrating that the necessary conditions for a particular theory to be true were present in the data.

As has been the case in so many other areas of psychology, the attempt to identify the theory of human motivation may not be the most productive way to proceed. This type of approach presupposes a regularity or uniformity to human behavior which is seldom justified by observable behavior.

The current research program assumes that there are several alternative motivational schemes which might influence human behavior. In an earlier report (Landy and Becker, 1981), we have outlined a theory of human motivation which is based on the premise that the rules which govern motivated or directed behavior vary both within and between individuals. This variation is thought to be related to cognitive structures which are jointly influenced by intra-individual cognitive skills and environmental interaction. The mechanism by which motivational rules change is likened to the interplay in Piagetian theory between assimilation and accomodation. Since the theory has been articlulated in some detail elsewhere (Landy and Becker, 1981), we will not present it again in this report.

ERIC  
COPY  
DIRECTOR

Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	

In its simplest form, Adaptive Motivation Theory proposes that there are qualitatively different modes or styles of motivation. These styles include an associationist style, a need/drive style, a socially based style, and a cognitive style. From that initial proposition, there are several variations that the theory might take. One variation might be considered the "strong" version. In this version, it would be proposed that individuals progress from one style of motivation to another in a regular sequence. The progress would be influenced by individual difference variables and environmental interaction. A second version of the theory could be identified as a "weak" version. In this version, individuals would be thought to belong to one subgroup or another, based on a typical motivational style which is adopted. In the weaker version, there is no assumption of movement from one style to another. A compromise version - one midway between "weak" and "strong" could also be considered. In this version, it would be proposed that individuals adopt different motivational styles to match certain environmental demands. Thus, while movement might occur, it would not be in a regular sequence such as was suggested in the "strong" version of the theory.

One of the unfortunate results of a research literature which is anchored to one or another specific theory is that there are no dependent variables available which allow an investigator to compare motivational styles directly. This represents a serious problem for our research since it is necessary to demonstrate that individuals vary in their styles. For that reason, the development of an appropriate dependent measure for motivational style is necessary for a suitable examination of the propositions of Adaptive Motivation Theory. In this

technical report, we will report on efforts to develop a measure of motivational style.

#### METHOD

One approach which might be taken to the development of a motivational style measure is that of self-report. It seems reasonable to ask people to describe themselves in terms of how they choose a course of action. While there may be problems of bias in such measures (e.g. expectancy effects or social desirability effect), it is possible to identify those biases if they occur and, in some cases, to statistically eliminate those biases through partialling techniques. In an attempt to develop a measure of motivation style, four prose descriptions were constructed which were thought to represent the four motivational styles central to the initial statement of Adaptive Motivation Theory. A fifth description was also written which was thought to represent a "random" style - a style characterized by no regularity in motivated behavior. There were two versions of each description - one long version and one short version. These descriptions appear in Appendix A.

#### SUBJECTS

The prose descriptions of motivation styles were presented to a wide range of individuals. These subjects varied in age, sex, work experience, supervisory responsibility, and occupation. The characteristics of the respondents are described in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Most of these subjects were participants in continuing education seminars conducted by Penn State University. In most instances, the subjects had come to University Park campus of Penn State for a period of several days of instruction in an area related to their occupation. We obtained a list of instructors and programs each month, and from that list we identified appropriate participants groups. We then contacted the appropriate instructor and requested permission to gather data from workshop participants.

Workshop instructors were generally positive about the research and willing to cooperate but requested that the participants fill out the questionnaires on their own time rather than during class time. Thus, most of the data on continuing education participants were gathered outside of formal classes, often by handing out questionnaires and requesting that they be returned in the campus mail.

In addition to workshop participants, university students filled out questionnaires for course credit. The students usually filled out the questionnaires in a classroom setting or in a controlled environment of some type. Table 2 describes the various samples which provided data

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

relevant to the subject of this technical report. Additional data were gathered as well but these data will be considered in a later technical report.

## VARIABLES

The motivational style descriptions, response format and instructions appear in Appendix A. In addition, depending on the nature of the sample, other demographic information was collected with a brief biographical data sheet. These sheets appear in Appendix B.

## RESULTS

In order to determine whether or not the motivational style descriptions were suitably sensitive, response patterns were examined for the influence of demographic variables. If the motivational style measure was a good one, according to the theory, there should be some observable influence of age and work experience on responses. Sex was considered as another variable of interest although Adaptive Motivation Theory would make no direct predictions of a gender-specific response pattern. The results will be reported for one demographic variable at a time.

### Age

In order to maintain roughly comparable cell sizes, subjects were grouped into 7 age categories. These groupings, respective cell sizes and means can be seen in Table 3. The means reported in Table 3 and subsequent tables refer to responses to each motivational style paragraph. A low mean reflects agreement with the paragraph; a high number reflects disagreement. There were no significant differences

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

among age groups on the any of the five motivational style responses.

#### Years of Work Experience

As was the case in the age analysis, in order to maintain comparable cell sizes, subjects were grouped into 8 categories of experience. These categories, their respective cell sizes and means appear in Table 4. There were no significant differences among experience groups on any of the five motivational style responses.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

#### Number of Full Time Jobs Held Previously

In order to maintain comparable cell sizes, subjects were placed in one of 8 categories representing number of jobs previously held. Category definitions, cell sizes and means appear in Table 5. There were

INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

no significant differences among these groups on any of the five the motivational style responses.

#### Number of People Supervised

In order to examine the effect of supervisory experience on motivational style, subjects were asked to report how many people they currently supervised. Responses were placed into one of 5 categories. The category definitions, cell sizes and means appear in Table 6. There were significant differences among "Number of People Supervised" groups on the "Random" Motivational style measure. Subjects who supervised larger numbers of employees were less likely to describe their motivational style as random ( $p=.02$ )

INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE



### Gender

Response patterns for males (N=200) were contrasted with those for females (N=194). There were no significant differences in the motivational style measures. Means appear in Table 7.

INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

### Years with Current Employer

The number of years that a subject had been employed by the current employer was used as a categorical variable. Eight categories were formed. The category definitions, cell sizes and means appear in Table 8. There were no significant differences among the groups.

INSERT TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE

### Occupations

Subjects were classified by occupation and the response patterns for each of the five motivational measures were examined. The occupational groups, cell sizes, and means appear in Table 9. Occupation did influence motivational style responses. The one-way analysis of variance for each measure was significant ( $F=3.24$ ;  $F=8.09$ ;  $F=4.50$ ;  $F=13.20$ ;  $F=1.71$ ). The Welch procedure for testing the equality of means with groups of unequal sample sizes and heterogeneous variances was applied to the data. This procedure yielded significance for all measures except the "Rational" measure ( $F=3.44$ ;  $F=4.08$ ;  $F=18.47$ ;  $F=10.23$ ;  $F=1.77$ ). All pairwise contrasts were performed on the main effects. Tables 10-13 present the significant contrasts for each dependent measures with a significant main effect. The Tukey WSD procedure was used for the multiple comparisons of means. This allowed the family-wise Type I error rate to be set at .05 (Games and Howell, 1976).

INSERT TABLES 9-13 ABOUT HERE

### DISCUSSION

The current study represents an attempt to develop an instrument which would be suitable for describing the varying motivational styles which might characterize an individual choosing a course of action. A series of paragraphs were developed which were intended to describe the following proposed motivational styles: Stimulus/Response, Need, Equity, and Rational. In addition, a paragraph was added which would describe an individual who makes choices on a spontaneous or "random" basis.

A heterogeneous response base was analyzed in order to determine the relative sensitivity of this type of instrument for describing individual differences in motivational style. A number of demographic variables were used as categorical variables in analyzing motivational responses. For the most part, there were no significant relationships between the categorical variables and the motivational responses. There were some exceptions. The categorical variable "Number of People Supervised" was related to the extent to which subjects described themselves as using a spontaneous or "Random" motivational style. The greater the number of people supervised, the less likely were those subjects to describe their own behavior as "random" or spontaneous. In addition, there were differences among occupational groups in all but the "rational" style measure.

Since the current study was a pilot study addressing instrumentation, there were no hypotheses of the traditional variety to examine. Nevertheless, the results were not particularly encouraging with respect to the current measures of motivational style. One might

have expected greater differences when responses were broken down by gender, experience and several other demographic variables. There was no particular problem with the variability of the responses. The standard deviations indicated that the respondents were using all of the four points on each response style scale. In examining the paragraph descriptions of the response styles, it seemed as if they might have been too complex, mixing several distinct elements of motivational style together. As an example, the Stimulus/response paragraph actually included overtones of both trial-and-error learning and overtones of reinforcement theory.

On the basis of the present analyses, one could reasonably conclude that the current paragraphs are not sufficiently sensitive to provide good measures of motivational style. The paragraph description is only one possible response mode. Other modes include the more typical Likert-type statements, quasi-projective devices, and peer ratings. Even though the measures were not judged to be adequate, they were not abandoned at this stage. The paragraphs were sent out to experts in the field of motivation for comment and revision. As a result of these comments, changes were made in the paragraphs. These changes and their effects on the measurement of motivational style will be described in a subsequent Tech Report.

### References

- Games, P.A. and Howell, J. F. Pairwise multiple comparison procedures with unequal N's and/or variances: a Monte Carlo study. Journal of Educational Statistics, 1976, 1, 113-125.
- Landy, F. J. and Becker, W. Adaptive Motivation Theory: Annual Report. Arlington: Office of Naval Research, 1981
- Locke, E. A., Shaw, K. N., Saari, L. M. and Latham, G. P. Goal setting and task performance:1969-1980. Psychological Bulletin, 1981, 90, 125-152.

Table 1

## Characteristics of Respondents (Frequencies)

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number of Fulltime Jobs</u>	<u>Number of Years With Current Employer</u>
18-25 (50)	0 (19)	1 (39)
26-30 (43)	1 (31)	2 (39)
31-35 (53)	2 (57)	3 (30)
36-40 (36)	3 (86)	4 (22)
41-45 (40)	4 (56)	5 (18)
46-55 (53)	5 (57)	6-10 (88)
56-71 (22)	6 (43)	11-15 (73)
Unknown (134)	7-20 (60)	16-40 (54)
	Unknown (21)	Unknown (68)

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number of Years of Total Employment</u>	<u>Number of People Supervised</u>
Males (200)	0 (19)	0 (31)
Females (194)	1-5 (31)	1-5 (80)
Unknown (37)	6-10 (65)	6-30 (48)
	11-15 (90)	31-100 (45)
	16-20 (68)	101-1000 (53)
	21-25 (49)	Unknown (174)
	26-30 (37)	
	31-40 (46)	
	Unknown (26)	

Table 2  
Composition of Samples (Groups) of  
Respondents and Sample Size

1. School Administrators (25)
2. Science Teachers (30)
3. Executive Managers (10)
4. Women's Club Members (15)
5. Transportation Supervisors (26)
6. Occupational Safety & Health Union Representatives (18)
7. Commercial Vehicles Supervisors (27)
8. School Admissions Counselors (27)
9. Fluid Mechanics (13)
10. Steelworkers (17)
11. Mushroom Farmers (36)
12. Finance Managers (20)
13. Secretaries (121)
14. Psychology Students (46)

Table 3

## Motivational Style Responses By Age Category

<u>Age</u>	<u>N</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Stimulus Response</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Need</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Equity</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Rational</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Random</u>
18-25	(50)	2.000	2.020	2.320	2.224	2.680
26-30	(42)	1.809	1.950	2.146	2.100	2.854
31-35	(52)	2.019	2.000	2.451	1.962	2.731
36-40	(35)	1.800	1.853	2.273	2.121	2.794
41-45	(40)	2.325	2.275	2.425	2.375	2.925
46-55	(52)	2.231	2.327	2.519	2.300	2.745
56-71	(22)	2.045	2.227	2.273	2.545	2.409

Table 4

## Motivational Style Responses by Years of Work Experience

<u>Total Years Work Experience</u>	<u>N</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Stimulus Response</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Need</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Equity</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Rational</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Random</u>
0	(19)	2.105	1.895	2.158	2.053	2.632
1-5	(31)	2.032	2.129	2.387	2.323	2.581
6-10	(65)	1.892	1.797	2.563	2.143	2.908
11-15	(90)	1.900	2.011	2.517	2.068	2.898
16-20	(68)	2.147	2.000	2.448	2.147	2.824
21-30	(86)	2.128	2.116	2.686	2.233	2.977
31-41	(46)	2.217	2.196	2.500	2.489	2.556



Table 5

## Motivational Style Responses by Number of Full Time Jobs

<u>Number of Jobs</u>	<u>N</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Stimulus Response</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Need</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Equity</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Rational</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Random</u>
0	(19)	2.053	1.947	2.316	2.053	2.632
1	(31)	1.871	2.067	2.258	2.032	2.774
2	(57)	2.123	2.070	2.625	2.321	2.614
3	(86)	1.965	1.965	2.553	2.024	2.837
4	(56)	2.125	2.089	2.804	2.309	2.839
5	(57)	1.930	1.839	2.196	2.071	2.964
6	(43)	2.140	2.163	2.619	2.238	2.833
7-20	(60)	2.150	2.102	2.542	2.328	2.759

Table 6

## Motivational Style Responses by Number of People Supervised

<u>Number of People Supervised</u>	<u>N</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Stimulus Response</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Need</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Equity</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Rational</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Random</u>
0	(31)	1.806	2.433	2.656	2.310	2.267
1-5	(80)	2.275	2.115	2.551	2.272	2.897
6-30	(48)	2.104	2.188	2.521	2.292	2.792
31-100	(45)	1.889	2.067	2.500	2.136	2.800
101-1000	(53)	2.113	2.056	2.151	2.077	3.058

Table 7

## Motivational Style Responses by Sex

<u>Sex</u>	<u>N</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Stimulus Response</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Need</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Equity</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Rational</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Random</u>
Male	(200)	2.025	2.126	2.335	2.219	2.737
Female	(194)	2.005	1.918	2.656	2.181	2.834

Table 8

## Motivational Style Responses by Number of Years With Current Employer

<u>Number of Years With Current Employer</u>	<u>N</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Stimulus Response</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Need</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Equity</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Rational</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Random</u>
1	(39)	2.154	2.282	2.589	2.289	2.897
2	(39)	1.897	1.895	2.667	2.000	2.946
3	(30)	2.267	2.100	2.633	2.333	2.700
4	(22)	2.318	2.091	2.227	2.429	2.591
5	(18)	2.000	2.111	2.278	2.167	2.944
6-10	(88)	2.011	1.966	2.662	2.198	3.000
11-15	(73)	1.986	1.986	2.356	2.208	2.639
16-40	(54)	2.204	2.222	2.630	2.208	2.792

Table 9

## Motivational Style Responses by Occupation

Occupational Group	<u>N</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Stimulus Response</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Need</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Equity</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Rational</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math>'s Random</u>
1. School Administrators	24	2.000	1.625	1.542	2.500	3.458
2. Science Teachers	30	1.667	1.700	1.567	2.133	2.900
3. Executives	10	2.300	2.500	3.300	1.700	2.100
4. Women's Club	15	2.000	2.733	2.200	2.667	2.667
5. Transportation Supervisors	26	1.923	2.577	3.308	2.038	1.600
6. OSHA Union	17	1.647	2.333	1.625	2.133	2.600
7. Vehicle Supervisors	27	2.222	1.692	1.815	2.407	3.296
8. Admissions Counselors	26	2.231	1.960	1.680	2.560	3.080
9. Fluid Mechanics	11	2.636	2.818	3.100	2.455	1.909
10. Steelworkers	17	1.588	2.294	3.000	2.125	2.059
11. Mushroom Farmers	34	2.029	2.265	2.939	2.970	3.118
12. Finance Managers	20	2.850	2.200	2.850	2.050	3.300
13. Secretaries	121	2.091	1.851	2.892	2.124	2.933
14. Psychology Students	46	1.848	1.783	2.435	1.978	2.674

TABLE 10

PAIRWISE CONTRASTS ON MEANS: STIMULUS-RESPONSE MOTIVATION MEASURE BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

	Science Teachers	Fluid Mechanics	School Administrators	Transportation Supervisors	Mushroom Farmers	Commercial Vehicle Supervisors	Finance Managers	Executive Managers	OSHA	Admissions Counselors	Psychology Students	Secretaries	Steelworkers	Womens Club
Science Teachers		4.191*					5.012*							
Fluid Mechanics														
School Administrators														
Transportation Supervisors														
Mushroom Farmers														
Commercial Vehicle Supervisors														
Finance Managers														
Executive Managers														
OSHA							4.256*							
Admissions Counselors														
Psychology Students							4.160*							
Secretaries														
Steelworkers							3.936*							
Womens Club														

\*(Significant  $\alpha=.05$ )

TABLE 11

PAIRWISE CONTRASTS ON MEANS: NEED MOTIVATION MEASURE BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

	Science Teachers	Fluid Mechanics	School Administrators	Transportation Supervisors	Mushroom Farmers	Commercial Vehicle Supervisors	Finance Managers	Executive Managers	OSHA	Admissions Counselors	Psychology Students	Secretaries	Steelworkers	Womens Club
Science Teachers				3.625*										
Fluid Mechanics														
School Administrators				3.563*										
Transportation Supervisors		3.889*												
Mushroom Farmers														
Commercial Vehicle Supervisors														
Finance Managers														
Executive Managers														
OSHA														
Admissions Counselors														
Psychology Students														
Secretaries														
Steelworkers														
Womens Club														

\*(Significant  $\alpha=.05$ )

TABLE 12

PAIRWISE CONTRASTS ON MEANS: EQUITY MOTIVATION MEASURE BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

	Science Teachers	Fluid Mechanics	School Administrators	Transportation Supervisors	Mushroom Farmers	Commercial Vehicle Supervisors	Finance Managers	Executive Managers	OSHA	Admissions Counselors	Psychology Students	Secretaries	Steelworkers	Womens Club
Science Teachers		4.585*		9.462*	7.083*		5.162*	6.098*			4.929*	9.026*	4.678*	
Fluid Mechanics														
School Administrators		4.556*		8.958*	6.773*		5.059*	6.001*			4.702*	8.284*	4.636*	
Transportation Supervisors														
Mushroom Farmers														
Commercial Vehicle Supervisors				6.530*	4.752*		3.653*	4.714*				5.388*		
Finance Managers														
Executive Managers														
OSHA		4.072*		7.302*	5.513*		4.301*	5.295*				6.272*	4.087*	
Admissions Counselors		4.194*		8.514*	6.276*		4.605*	5.606*			4.109*	7.783*	4.247*	
Psychology Students				4.429*										
Secretaries														
Steelworkers														
Womens Club														

\*(Significant  $\alpha=.05$ )



TABLE 13

PAIRWISE CONTRASTS ON MEANS: RANDOM MOTIVATION MEASURE BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

	Science Teachers	Fluid Mechanics	School Administrators	Transportation Supervisors	Mushroom Farmers	Commercial Vehicle Supervisors	Finance Managers	Executive Managers	OSHA	Admissions Counselors	Psychology Students	Secretaries	Steelworkers	Womens Club
Science Teachers														
Fluid Mechanics			4.835*			4.148*	4.043*							
School Administrators														
Transportation Supervisors	5.647*		9.103*		7.053*	7.524*	7.098*			6.637*	5.412*	7.781*		4.203*
Mushroom Farmers														
Commercial Vehicle Supervisors														
Finance Managers														
Executive Managers			4.923*			4.096*	3.960*							
OSHA														
Admissions Counselors														
Psychology Students			3.870*											
Secretaries														
Steelworkers			4.630*			3.903*	3.794*							
Womens Club														

\*(Significant  $\alpha=.05$ )

APPENDIX A

Each of the next five (5) pages contains a paragraph that describes a type of person. For each page, read the paragraph, then decide whether the description is characteristic of YOU. Choose the response below the paragraph that best fits your way of doing things.

TYPE A

Some people make decisions about what to do based on past experiences. When confronted with a decision about something important, they think about past experiences which were similar. If a past action was beneficial, that is, if a past action has led to a valued reward, this person is likely to try it again. On the other hand, if a past action was not beneficial, or negative, and led to something undesirable or unwanted like a punishment, this person would not be likely to try this action again. In general, this type of person makes decisions based on the short term effects of actions, rather than the long term effects. These people would describe their lives in terms of "cause and effects" rather than long drawn out rationalizations. Or they might say that their life experiences were based on "trial and error" and that one learns best from one's mistakes.

(CIRCLE ONE)

LIKE  
ME

SLIGHTLY  
LIKE ME

NOT MUCH  
LIKE ME

NOT AT ALL  
LIKE ME

TYPE B

Some people make decisions about what to do according to what they feel at the moment. These people are likely to be spontaneous in their activities--just as likely to do one thing as another. Rather than rely upon past experiences to guide their actions, these people are likely to try something new. They don't really plan what they are going to do next. They act upon the feeling that they have at the moment. That is, they are not likely to worry about past actions that they have taken--and the consequences of those actions. In general, these people would describe themselves as being open-minded and living for the moment.

(CIRCLE ONE)

LIKE  
ME

SLIGHTLY  
LIKE ME

NOT MUCH  
LIKE ME

NOT AT ALL  
LIKE ME

TYPE C

Some people make decisions about what to do based on a particular need that they have at the time. They spend their energy directed toward meeting that need which is important to them, at that particular time. These people have learned the things that they must do to accomplish a desired need--and they act in accordance. Things that have worked in the past to gain the desired object or reward are remembered and tried again. This type of person gains satisfaction or pleasure from accomplishing the desired need. Once a specific need is met, the person directs their energy toward satisfying a new, different need. These people would describe their lives as directing their energy toward satisfying a need or desire which happens to be important to them.

(CIRCLE ONE)

LIKE  
ME

SLIGHTLY  
LIKE ME

NOT MUCH  
LIKE ME

NOT AT ALL  
LIKE ME

TYPE D

Some people make decisions about what to do based on what they see others doing. They act on the basis of how they have seen others make out in a similar situation. Certain people around them act as models. They compare themselves to those models. They examine their own efforts and compare them to the efforts of others. They try to determine if the things that people get are fair, compared to what they did to get them. In general, this type of person learns what to do in situations by examining the things others do, and determining if they want to go about it the same way.

(CIRCLE ONE)

LIKE  
ME

SLIGHTLY  
LIKE ME

NOT MUCH  
LIKE ME

NOT AT ALL  
LIKE ME

TYPE E

Some people make decisions about what to do by thinking of all the possible situations which might arise and what will happen in each situation. They make their choices about what to do based on the odds of various things happening. They keep in mind the value of the results of their actions in each situation. They also keep in mind the odds that they will actually be able to accomplish their efforts before they decide to do something. They act on something as a result of planned decisions, after examining the choices and assessing the alternatives.

(CIRCLE ONE)

LIKE  
ME

SLIGHTLY  
LIKE ME

NOT MUCH  
LIKE ME

NOT AT ALL  
LIKE ME

Each of the next five (5) pages contains a paragraph that describes a type of person. For each page, read the paragraph, then decide whether the description is characteristic of YOU. Choose the response below the paragraph that best fits your way of doing things.



When I have to do something, I stop to think about what happened the last time I was in a similar situation. I remember good and bad things which came about because of past actions. I try to figure out exactly what it will take to get a reward or avoid a punishment in every situation.

(CIRCLE ONE)

LIKE  
ME

SLIGHTLY  
LIKE ME

NOT MUCH  
LIKE ME

NOT AT ALL  
LIKE ME

When I have to do something, I try not to worry too much about how to get it done. I make decisions on the spur of the moment. Sometimes I may act one way in a situation and the next time in another way. I don't really have a set way of choosing what to do. I just let things happen.

(CIRCLE ONE)

LIKE  
ME

SLIGHTLY  
LIKE ME

NOT MUCH  
LIKE ME

NOT AT ALL  
LIKE ME

When I have something to do, I try to think of all the possible situations which might arise and what will happen in each situation. I make my choice about what to do based on the odds of various situations occurring. I try to keep in mind both the value of the reward (or punishment) in each situation and the odds that I will actually receive the reward (or punishment).

(CIRCLE ONE)

LIKE  
ME

SLIGHTLY  
LIKE ME

NOT MUCH  
LIKE ME

NOT AT ALL  
LIKE ME

When I have to do something, I try to choose an action which will satisfy one of my needs, such as a need for friendship, or a need for success. In every situation, I try to consider my overall or general needs and desires so that I will be satisfied in the long run.

(CIRCLE ONE)

LIKE  
ME

SLIGHTLY  
LIKE ME

NOT MUCH  
LIKE ME

NOT AT ALL  
LIKE ME

When I have to do something, I think about others like me, in the same situation. I tend to compare myself to other people to determine what I should do. Based on how others have made out in a situation, I make my decision. I am concerned with being fairly treated compared to how others are treated and I do things on that basis.

(CIRCLE ONE)

LIKE  
ME

SLIGHTLY  
LIKE ME

NOT MUCH  
LIKE ME

NOT AT ALL  
LIKE ME